

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www uspo gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNET DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,923	08/12/2004	Melissa Vass	158982 (GEM-0163)	4922
23413 CANTOR COI	7590 03/04/200 BURN, LLP	EXAMINER		
20 Church Stre 22nd Floor		CWERN, JONATHAN		
Hartford, CT 0	6103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	3.00		3737	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2008	DADED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/710,923	VASS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jonathan G. Cwern	3737		

	Jonathan G. Cwern	3737	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi all (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aban t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION.) See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor     (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	e issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (F	PTOL -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Amendment (i	1 OL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>14-45</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	e because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	ID 11 0 0 1111		
	/Ruth S. Smith/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3737	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to applicant's arguments in regards to the prior art failing to show "in location and navigation of an interventional tool", examiner respectfully disagrees in view of applicant's claim language. However, applicant's claim language includes the phrase "in at least one of..." The using means that the prior art only needs to show one of bi-ventricular pacing planning, atrial fibrillation planning, artrial flutter planning procedure, OR location and navigation of an interventional tool. The prior art does NOT have to teach location and navigation of an interventional tool to meet the claimed invention.

In regards to applicant's arguments in regards to the action being improperly finally rejected, examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant cites the office action dated 6/80/7, however there were daims previously filed in that application on 11/18/04, and rejected in the Non-Final rejection dated 12/90/4. In view of these claims, all claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and ould have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. The use of the "at least one of" language" does not require "in location and navigation of an interventional tool" and therefore the scope of the claim has not changed.

The amendment to the claims will be entered because the amendments to the claims do not change the scope of the claims.